DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 450 654 HE 033 830

TITLE	Rewarding and Developing Staff in Higher Education: Invitation To Apply for Funds.
INSTITUTION	Higher Education Funding Council for England, Bristol.
REPORT NO	HEFCE-01/16
PUB DATE	2001-03-00
NOTE	22p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Higher Education Funding Council for England, Northavon House, Coldharbour Lane, Bristol, BS16 1QD, England. Tel: 0117-931-7317; Fax: 0117-931-7203; Web site: www.hefce.ac.uk.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	FDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Colleges; Educational Finance; *Financial Support; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Human Resources; *Incentives; *Professional Development; Program Development; Program Implementation; *Resource Allocation
IDENTIFIERS	*England

ABSTRACT

This document provides feedback on the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) consultation (questionnaire responses about professional development in higher education) and invites higher education institutions to apply for special funding to support the development and implementation of human resource strategies. Responses to the consultation from 67 universities, 14 general colleges, 25 specialist institutions, 5 trade unions, 12 representative bodies, and 3 consultants and consulting organizations show that respondents overwhelmingly approved the government's initiative to provide 330 million pounds to invest in human resources development, but respondents from higher education institutions and trade unions noted that these resources would not be sufficient to cover all of the priority areas identified in the consultation. Respondents thought that the funding should be offered for longer than the 3 years specified in the initiative and suggested some changes to clarify the language of the initiative. Funds are to be released to institutions in proportion to their combined basic HEFCE grants for teaching and research. Funding will be released following consideration of human resources strategies for addressing certain priority areas. Institutions are invited to submit their human resources strategies by June 1, 2001. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 450 654

March 01/16 Invitation

Respond by 1 June 2001

Rewarding and developing staff in higher education

Invitation to apply for funds

R. Kier

2A

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HIGHER EDUCATION hefce FUNDING COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND

© HEFCE 2001

The copyright for this publication is held by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). The material may be copied or reproduced provided that the source is acknowledged and the material, wholly or in part, is not used for commercial gain. Use of the material for commercial gain requires the prior written permission of the HEFCE.

Rewarding and developing staff in higher education

To	Heads of higher education institutions funded by HEFCE and TTA
Of interest to those responsible for	Human resources management and institutional strategic management
Reference	01/16
Publication date	March 2001
Enquiries to	Claire Warnes (for general enquiries on this special funding initiative) tel 0117 931 7311 e-mail c.warnes@hefce.ac.uk HEFCE Regional Consultants (list at Annex A) (for enquiries on institutional human resource strategies)

Executive summary

Purpose

1. This document provides feedback on the HEFCE consultation (HEFCE 00/56) and invites higher education institutions to apply for special funding to support the development and implementation of human resource strategies. These additional resources to recruit, retain, reward and develop staff in higher education were announced as part of the Government's year 2000 spending review.

Key points

3. We provide a summary of the responses received to the consultation.

4. We will distribute the funds to institutions in proportion to their combined basic recurrent HEFCE grants for teaching and research. Funding will be released following consideration of human resource strategies addressing certain priority areas. The Teacher Training Agency (TTA) will provide support under this initiative for TTA-funded activity.

5. Institutions are free to determine their own objectives and specific targets. We will monitor these through annual operating statements.

Action required

6. Institutions are invited to submit their HR strategies to us by 1 June 2001. These strategies may be submitted as 'full' or 'emerging', and this information should be indicated by attaching a completed Annex E to the front of the strategy (see page 18).

Introduction

6. As part of the year 2000 spending review the Government announced additional resources to help institutions recruit, retain and develop staff, as well as helping to modernise management processes in the sector. The Government has set aside £50 million in 2001-02 rising to £110 million in 2002-03 and £170 million in 2003-04 (these figures refer to financial years). Converting to academic years, we will allocate £80 million in 2001-02 and £120 million in 2002-03. We expect to allocate at least £170 million in 2003-04. The TTA has received £2.3 million for the financial year 2001-02 rising to £5.5 million in 2002-03 and £7.8 million in 2003-04. The equivalent amount for the 2001-02 academic year is £3.8 million. The indicative amounts for the academic years 2002-03 and 2003-04 are £5.8 million and £9.1 million respectively.

7. These additional resources recognise that the world class reputation of the higher education (HE) sector depends on its ability to recruit and retain good quality staff. Over the last decade the sector has an impressive record – delivering world-leading research, maintaining low drop-out rates and sustaining a reputation for quality that continues to attract a significant share of the market for overseas students. All these achievements depend on the commitment and expertise of staff.

8. Human resource (HR) management in higher education has many positive aspects, including devolved responsibilities, wide participation in decision-making, a questioning ethos and a good record of delivery. However, in a more competitive world there will inevitably be more demands. High quality HR management will be a key element to future success. The additional funding will enable higher education institutions (HEIs) to support existing investments and create new opportunities.

9. The consultation paper stated that we would release funding to institutions on receipt of an HR strategy that identifies objectives, describes how the money will be spent, and sets specific targets. These would include improvements both to outcomes and to HR management processes. Recognising the diversity of needs across institutions, we stated that it is for institutions themselves to determine their priorities and how these would be tackled. We stated that we expect strategies to specifically cover the areas outlined in Annex B.

10. The consultation proposed that we would allocate funding as a proportion of an institution's total core funding from HEFCE: the assumed resource for teaching, plus the basic research grant.

Feedback from consultation (HEFCE 00/56)

11. We asked institutions, representative bodies and professional bodies to respond to the following questions:

a. Do you agree that human resource strategies should cover the areas set out Annex B? Should anything else be added?

b. Is the proposed method of distributing and monitoring the funding likely to lead to demonstrable improvements in human resource management whilst minimising transaction costs?

c. Do you agree that the HEFCE should explore the development of a limited number of sector-wide human resource performance indicators or measures?

12. A list of those organisations submitting written responses is at Annex D. A summary of the responses is set out below. These include comments made at the workshop sessions of our Annual Conference in Manchester in January 2001.

General responses

13. Respondents overwhelmingly welcomed the initiative to provide £330 million to invest in human resources development. However, respondents from both institutions and trade unions commented that these resources were insufficient to cover all six of the priority areas set out in the consultation. In support of this, institutions referred to the figures identified in the Bett Report and gave examples of the typical costs of introducing job evaluation schemes.

14. Respondents welcomed the fact that the funding would be available for three years, but

5

made the point that investment needs to continue longer term and eventually should be considered as core funding.

15. Respondents requested that the term 'staff pay supplement' which appeared in Annex A of the consultation should be amended to 'human resource supplement', since the funding relates to a wider range of priority areas than simply pay. This we have done.

16. A number of institutions stated that the HEFCE should be sensitive to the current industrial relations climate within the HE sector. Trade unions were concerned that our approach should not undermine national pay bargaining. Two trade unions raised the point that national pay bargaining covers the whole of the UK, while this initiative covers only English institutions. Additionally, some trade unions commented that funding should be directed at pay and no other activities.

17. In developing the consultation, we were sensitive to these issues and framed the consultation to give employers and unions sufficient flexibility to take this initiative forward in whichever way they see fit. This should not cause alterations to the current negotiating framework, or to institutions' and trade unions' ability to negotiate over terms and conditions.

18. A few respondents felt that the proliferation of strategies for different initiatives will become unsustainable. We believe that investment in human resources is central to the effective management of higher education institutions. We therefore expect HEIs to integrate their HR strategy within their corporate plans and alongside documents such as their learning and teaching, widening participation, research and Higher Education Reach-out to Business and the Community (HEROBC) strategies.

Responses relating to the areas of coverage of the HR strategies

19. The majority of respondents agreed that the priority areas which we set out were correct. Additional comments were as follows:

a. Some institutions felt that it would be helpful to provide specific permission to include expenditure on infrastructure and communication. We believe that it may be necessary for institutions to use the funding to invest in technology or communication to support their activities in the six priority areas, but it would be wrong to use the funding to cover investment in activities that were not directly supporting at least one of the priority areas.

b. Some institutions commented that it would be helpful to use the funding to support the early retirement of staff. Funding can be used for that purpose so long as it is in the context of a regular review of staffing needs as described in priority area d of our consultation (see Annex B).

c. The Universities and Colleges Employers Association (UCEA), Universities UK, Standing Conference of Principals (SCOP) and Higher Education Staff Development Agency (HESDA) submitted a joint response to the consultation, welcoming the proposed approach. Their comments included the fact that institutions should already be addressing the priority area identified of tackling poor performance. There is concern about the operation of model statutes in the pre-1992 institutions, as mentioned in the Bett Report. UCEA has established a working group under the chairmanship of Professor Graham Zellick, Vice-Chancellor of the University of London, and discussions on this matter are to commence shortly with the Privy Council. We will work with these representative bodies to monitor progress on the initiative within the HE sector.

d. A large number of institutional respondents interpreted Annex B paragraph e narrowly, as the HEFCE simply requiring institutions to develop performance-related pay (PRP). Some institutions and trade union respondents commented that PRP was likely to be divisive and non-productive within the HE sector, especially given the relatively low level of funding to support all of the priority areas. We recognise the challenges posed by introducing performance review systems linked to reward. For this reason, the consultation explained that

we do not expect this area to be addressed until 2002-03, giving institutions time to consider the implications and to focus their energy in the first year on addressing the first three priority areas (outlined in Annex B). Some institutions may choose to address all six priority areas sooner.

e. The Equal Opportunities Commission expressed the view that HEFCE, as the largest funding body for higher education, is obliged to ensure that its funds are not spent in a discriminatory way and to take reasonable steps to ensure this. We are committed to promoting equal opportunities within the sector. We will monitor how funds under this initiative are used to pursue this objective through the analysis of the HR strategies. We will also support the parallel work of the newly formed Equality Challenge Unit.

f. One institution commented that requiring targets for equal opportunities and salary levels is inappropriate. We believe it is for institutions to set their own targets. However, targets across all priority areas are necessary if institutions and HEFCE are to monitor the development of good practice in HR management in the HE sector. Another institution commented that insufficient reference was made to the strong emphasis that HEIs place on teamwork. This is explicitly covered in priority area e (Annex B). We believe institutions have scope themselves to recognise the contribution of individuals and teams to organisational performance within the other priority areas.

g. One institution believed that an omission from the priority areas related to the encouragement of entrepreneurship and risk-taking among academic and support staff in pursuit of innovation and commercialisation. We believe this could be covered as a development issue or may be appropriately considered within existing HEROBC funding, and in future by the Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF).

20. Given the consultation responses we will retain the six areas set out for inclusion in institutional HR strategies. We believe they provide sufficient flexibility for institutions to address their own specific priorities.

Responses relating to the method of allocation and monitoring

21. Institutions generally welcomed our proposed method of allocation and monitoring as it will enable them to target their own priorities as efficiently as possible. However, major concerns arose over the use of the formula for distribution of funding, which only recognised HEFCE-funded activity. The following issues were raised:

a. The strongest objections were received from institutions with TTA-funded activity. In response to these concerns we have had discussions with the DfEE, and established that the TTA grant included an element for rewarding and developing HE staff. We have agreed with the TTA that it will allocate a comparable amount to institutions which have TTA-funded activity. To minimise administration costs, TTA will join with us to distribute funding. Indicative allocations for both HEFCE and TTA funding are at Annex C.

b. Similar objections were received relating to institutions that receive NHS funding contracts. However, the situation here is different because institutions that bid for NHS contracts make judgements about the economic price of provision. As the market has determined the price, there is no convincing argument as to why we should interfere with this mechanism.

c. A number of large further education colleges (FECs) which operate mixed further education (FE) and HE provision, commented that they receive half of their funds from HE sources, yet are ineligible to receive funds under this special initiative. We support FECs which provide HE via the HE in FE Development Fund. The sums distributed through this fund are in part determined by the levels of special funding that HEIs receive. Therefore, when determining future budgets for the HE in FE Development

7

Fund we will take into account the special funding which we allocate to HEIs via the Rewarding and Developing Staff in HE initiative. We believe this is the best way to target our resources to support the development of HE in FECs. A small number of institutions commented that funding should be allocated on the basis of all FE and HE activity being undertaken at an institution. The funding for this initiative is for HE activities only, so it cannot cover those areas for which the FEFC is solely responsible.

Additionally, where an FEC is in an indirect funding relationship with us, the funding it receives will form part of the HEFCE grant that determines the level of allocation to the partner HEI from this fund. We would expect the HEI to take account of the needs of the relevant staff involved within partner FECs in determining its strategy.

d. Five institutions requested that research-intensive institutions receive additional funds because of the high costs of recruiting and retaining high quality research staff. On the other hand, several smaller institutions requested additional funding for small and specialist institutions, which have specific problems in recruiting, retaining, rewarding and developing staff. A further five institutions commented that the method of allocation should be based on the headcount of staff employed by institutions.

   We do not believe there is a case for further targeting the funding at any particular part of the sector, since all face their own specific challenges. Headcount of staff does not easily allow publicly and non-publicly funded activity to be separated.

e. One trade union and a number of institutions suggested that some funding should be conditional upon membership of the Institute of Learning and Teaching. Institutions would be free to use the money to support this form of staff development, but we believe it is for institutions to determine whether this represents a priority for them.

f. Four institutions commented that HEFCE's other special funding initiatives are used to support new activities. Since HR management is not a new activity, these institutions felt that the special funding approach was inappropriate as it increased the risk of intervention by HEFCE in institutions' activities and has the potential to stifle innovation. We have sought to provide institutions with as much freedom as possible, while assuring government stakeholders that the investment in recruiting, retaining, rewarding and developing staff will be effective.

   One institution commented that the monitoring should be subject to HEFCE's project to assess the accountability burden of its activities on the institutions which it funds. We recognise that this initiative will have an impact on the accountability burden, and have assessed this as part of our project. We do not believe the arrangements set out in this report represent a major burden to institutions. For this reason, we decided to allocate the funds by formula and to monitor the activity through the annual operating statement that each institution currently submits to us. We will also review the accountability impact as part of our scheduled evaluation of the scheme in Autumn 2002.

g. The joint response from Universities UK, SCOP, HESDA and UCEA requested that the method of allocation include an option to phase indicative allocations in line with institutions' own priorities. A number of institutional respondents requested that there also be an option to carry forward unspent funds. We agree that, where we can, we will allow institutions to phase their indicative allocations in line with their own priorities. However, we would expect institutions to fully spend their allocations over the three-year period.

Responses relating to performance indicators

22. Generally, but not universally, institutions welcomed our proposition to explore the feasibility of operating 'light-touch' monitoring of this initiative through the development of performance indicators (PIs). However, the key issues raised were

that for PIs to be meaningful we would need to :

- cluster similar types of institution together
- develop appropriate targets for each of the PIs.

23. We will explore the usefulness of PIs, concentrating in the first instance on equal opportunities working with the Equality Challenge Framework. We will undertake work on this during 2002.

Other responses

24. One trade union response stated that, while willing to look at the means of ensuring equal pay for work of equal value, it did not accept the appropriateness of factor-based job evaluation schemes. A number of institutions took a similar position based on the expected cost of implementing such a process. Other institutions thought job evaluation might produce the biggest long-term saving for institutions by replacing existing grading structures for support staff.

25. There is no legal requirement for employers to use job evaluation, although there is a requirement for equal pay for work of equal value. We accept that the single best defence against equal value claims is a properly constructed job evaluation scheme. The HE Equality Challenge Unit is setting up an institutional advisory service which will give guidance to institutions on their position. We will draw the attention of the new HE Equality Challenge Unit to this consultation and to the issue of institution-wide job evaluation, so that it can provide appropriate advice to institutions on legal requirements and good practice.

26. Five institutional respondents and one trade union commented on the membership of the advisory group. We will ensure that the advisory group contains an appropriate range of individuals who understand the HE sector and the particular HR issues it faces.

27. Some institutions also raised a number of other HR-related issues, including those concerning the operation of the Universities Superannuation Scheme and Teachers' Superannuation Scheme, and raised a number of presentational points.

28. We have taken account of the range of responses to the consultation in producing this invitation to institutions to apply for special funding.

Allocating the additional resources

29. We will distribute the additional resources as a conditional grant. Each higher education institution will be allocated a proportion of the total funding according to the size of its combined HEFCE teaching assumed resource and basic recurrent research grant. Institutions with TTA-funded activity will be allocated further funding, based on the size of their TTA-funded activities. Indicative allocations for future years from the HEFCE and (where appropriate) the TTA are shown at Annex C.

30. We will release funding to institutions on receipt of an HR strategy that identifies objectives, describes how the money will be spent, and sets specific targets. This strategy may be submitted as 'full' or 'emerging'.

31. We will allocate funding for three years where we receive a 'full' strategy that explains in detail how and when an institution will cover, or is already covering, all six priority areas of Annex B.

32. Institutions may wish to submit 'emerging' strategies which explain in detail how and when they will cover priority areas a, b and c of Annex B and which defer consideration of priority areas d, e and f. In this case institutions should provide details of how they intend to develop 'full' strategies. On approval of an 'emerging' strategy, we will release funds for one year, with the further two years' funding being released on receipt and approval of a 'full' strategy in June 2002.

33. Institutions will already be addressing many of these areas and, for some, further investment in a particular area is of limited value. For this reason we want the additional funding to be targeted at institutional priorities, with strategies simply describing action within each area.

34. Funds will be released as long as the human resource strategy:

- integrates with the institution's mission and strategic plan

- covers all the priority areas listed above
- supports additional activity or the extension of existing activity that will yield further improvement
- contains targets that can be used to assess the effectiveness of the expenditure.

Strategies should cover three years, from 2001-02 to 2003-04. They will be reviewed by an advisory group comprising sector representatives and others with HR expertise. We will expect institutions to demonstrate the integration of their HR strategies within their corporate plan and alongside activities such as learning and teaching, research, widening participation and HEROBC strategies. Specific reference should be made to staff development within research strategies. The advisory panel reserves the right to refuse funding to strategies which do not meet the criteria laid out in Annex B. The panel also reserves the right to approve as 'emerging' those strategies submitted as 'full' if it is felt that the information provided is insufficient to warrant three years of funding. The panel will also refuse strategies which include proposals that it would consider discriminatory.

35. We would normally expect institutions to phase expenditure in line with the indicative allocations at Annex C, but some institutions may have a special requirement to phase their funding differently over the three years. Where institutions submit a 'full' strategy in June 2001, they should indicate if they wish to phase their funding differently. Where we can, we will accommodate these requests.

Format of the HR strategies

36. Each institution should complete the checklist at Annex E and attach it to the front of its human resource strategy. In particular, each institution should indicate whether it wishes its strategy to be considered as 'full' or 'emerging' by ticking the appropriate box on this sheet.

37. We do not wish to prescribe to institutions a desired format for HR strategies. Although institutions must explain how they intend to address the six priority areas listed in Annex B, the content and structure of their strategies is at their own discretion. Indeed, they may wish to cross-refer to existing HR and other institutional strategies (learning and teaching, widening participation, research and HEROBC). Where institutions cross-refer to existing documents, they should provide a copy of these documents if we do not already hold copies. We hold the following documents for all institutions (which therefore do not need to be provided): corporate plans, widening participation strategies, learning and teaching strategies, and approved proposals under HEROBC. We do not hold copies of institutional research strategies.

38. Strategies should include a set of institutional objectives for recruiting, retaining, rewarding and developing staff linked to set of targets which can be monitored and evaluated by institutions and by HEFCE.

Monitoring and evaluation

39. The additional resources have been provided for a specific purpose, on a 'something for something' basis. Effective monitoring and evaluation will provide confidence that strategies are being achieved and that continued investment beyond 2003-04 is worthwhile. Our approach is designed to meet these requirements whilst minimising the burden on institutions and ourselves.

40. In detail the process is as follows:

a. Institutions submit strategies by 1 June 2001.

b. The HEFCE, acting on the advice of an advisory panel, confirms or otherwise funding by 6 July 2001.

c. The HEFCE, again working with an advisory panel and following sector consultation, issues good practice guidance based on an analysis of institutions' strategies by December 2001.

d. Where institutions have submitted 'emerging' strategies, or where the advisory group has approved strategies as 'emerging', institutions submit 'full' strategies by 1 June 2002.

e. Institutions report on performance against strategies through their 2001-02 annual operating statements. Institutions may revise and resubmit strategies in the light of the good practice guidance that we will issue in December 2001.

f. Institutions report on the effectiveness of their strategies through their 2002-03 operating statement, including the achievement of specific targets.

g. During 2003-04, the HEFCE evaluates the effectiveness of the investment throughout the sector, using the institutions' operating statement submissions, supplemented, where necessary, by additional research.

41. Institutions may also wish to consider ongoing revision of other existing institutional strategies (including learning and teaching, widening participation and research) to disseminate any good practice developed during the production of their HR strategies.

Actions in the event of targets not being delivered

42. When monitoring strategies through the annual operating statement, we will expect institutions to report on progress against the objectives stated in their strategies and to identify slippage or changes in the proposed action in light of these. Evidence of progress will be used to support any a case for further investment as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review process.

43. We plan to discuss with universities and colleges whether performance indicators or specific reviews could be used to demonstrate sector-wide progress and needs. In time the evidence of sector-wide demonstration of performance may lead to the incorporation of this investment into core funding.

Timetable

Date	Event
12 February 2001	Responses to consultation received
26 March 2001	Applications for funds issued
1 June 2001	Full and emerging strategies received
6 July 2001	Funding confirmed
21 December 2001	Good practice guidance issued
1 June 2002	Receipt of full strategies from those institutions which submitted emerging strategies in June 2001

Application procedure

44. Institutions should submit four paper copies of their HR strategies together with a completed Annex E by **1 June 2001** to:

Claire Warnes
HEFCE
Northavon House
Coldharbour Lane
BRISTOL BS16 1QD

Annex A

HEFCE Regional Consultants – contact details

Region	Regional Consultant	Telephone	E-mail
Eastern	Derek Hicks	0117 931 7460	d.hicks@hefce.ac.uk
East Midlands	John Selby	0117 931 7343	john.selby@hefce.ac.uk
London	David Cormican	0117 931 7021	d.cormican@hefce.ac.uk
North East	Derek Hicks	0117 931 7460	d.hicks@hefce.ac.uk
North West	Kate Murray	0117 931 7022	k.murray@hefce.ac.uk
South East	Rama Thirunamachandran	0117 931 7024	r.thirunamachandran@hefce.ac.uk
South West	David Noyce	0117 931 7349	d.noyce@hefce.ac.uk
West Midlands	Kate Ashcroft	0117 931 7313	k.ashcroft@hefce.ac.uk
Yorkshire and Humberside	Roger Lewis	0117 931 7027	r.lewis@herce.ac.uk

Annex B

Specific areas which the HR strategies should cover

Each HR strategy should cover the following areas:

a. Address recruitment and retention difficulties in a targeted and cost-effective manner.

b. Meet specific staff development and training objectives that not only equip staff to meet their current needs but also prepare them for future changes, such as using new technologies for learning and teaching. This would include management development.

c. Develop equal opportunities targets, with programmes to implement good practice throughout an institution. This should include ensuring equal pay for work for equal value, using institution-wide systems of job evaluation. This could involve institutions working collectively – regionally or nationally.

Strategies should also cover how institutions will address (or are already addressing) the need to achieve:

d. Regular reviews of staffing needs, reflecting changes in market demands and technology. The reviews would consider overall numbers and the balance of different categories of staff.

e. Annual performance reviews of all staff, based on open and objective criteria, with rewards connected to the performance of individuals including, where appropriate, their contribution to teams.

f. Action to tackle poor performance.

Annex C

Indicative allocations

Indicative HEFCE allocations for rewarding and developing staff in HE (£)*

	Total assumed resource 2000-01	HR Supplement 2001-02	HR Supplement 2002-03	HR Supplement 2003-04
Anglia Polytechnic University	43,807,342	738,661	1,107,992	1,569,655
Aston University	24,757,772	417,455	626,183	887,092
University of Bath	37,151,411	626,432	939,647	1,331,167
Bath Spa University College	10,911,757	183,989	275,984	390,978
Birkbeck College	28,499,980	480,555	720,832	1,021,179
University of Birmingham	97,048,052	1,636,384	2,454,576	3,477,316
Bishop Grosseteste College	514,195	8,670	13,005	18,424
Bolton Institute of Higher Education	20,357,984	343,268	514,902	729,444
Bournemouth University	28,926,235	487,742	731,613	1,036,452
University of Bradford	33,097,035	558,068	837,103	1,185,895
Bretton Hall	6,784,356	114,395	171,592	243,089
University of Brighton	37,627,649	634,462	951,693	1,348,231
University of Bristol	78,676,518	1,326,611	1,989,916	2,819,048
Brunel University	45,137,894	761,096	1,141,645	1,617,330
Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College	20,553,505	346,565	519,847	736,450
University of Cambridge	127,059,815	2,142,430	3,213,644	4,552,663
Institute of Cancer Research	9,452,363	159,382	239,073	338,686
Canterbury Christ Church University College	14,033,038	236,619	354,929	502,816
University of Central England	46,119,336	777,645	1,166,468	1,652,496
University of Central Lancashire	56,093,305	945,822	1,418,733	2,009,872
Central School of Speech and Drama	3,732,290	62,932	94,398	133,731
Cheltenham and Gloucester College of HE	23,136,564	390,119	585,179	829,003
Chester College of Higher Education	9,749,376	164,390	246,585	349,329
University College Chichester	8,360,340	140,969	211,453	299,558
City University	25,822,214	435,403	653,105	925,232
Coventry University	49,262,457	830,643	1,245,965	1,765,116
Cranfield University	20,898,110	352,375	528,563	748,797
Cumbria College of Art & Design	2,945,552	49,667	74,500	105,542
Dartington College of Arts	2,655,981	44,784	67,176	95,166
De Montfort University	70,155,518	1,182,933	1,774,400	2,513,733
University of Derby	31,208,921	526,232	789,348	1,118,243
University of Durham	52,138,117	879,131	1,318,697	1,868,154
University of East Anglia	33,517,844	565,164	847,746	1,200,973
University of East London	40,017,277	674,755	1,012,132	1,433,854
Edge Hill College of Higher Education	11,359,995	191,547	287,321	407,038
Institute of Education	10,592,897	178,613	267,920	379,553
University of Essex	25,339,324	427,261	640,892	907,930
University of Exeter	39,130,130	659,796	989,694	1,402,066
Falmouth College of Arts	5,516,387	93,015	139,523	197,657
Goldsmiths College	23,117,236	389,793	584,690	828,311
University of Greenwich	50,924,751	858,672	1,288,008	1,824,678
Harper Adams University College	7,298,740	123,068	184,602	261,520
University of Hertfordshire	49,638,831	836,989	1,255,484	1,778,602
Homerton College, Cambridge	2,483,748	41,880	62,820	88,995
University of Huddersfield	43,030,053	725,555	1,088,332	1,541,804
University of Hull	40,315,576	679,784	1,019,677	1,444,542
Imperial College	107,629,123	1,814,797	2,722,196	3,856,444

Keele University	21,787,389	367,370	551,055	780,661
University of Kent at Canterbury	32,621,057	550,043	825,064	1,168,841
Kent Institute of Art & Design	7,197,195	121,356	182,034	257,882
King Alfred's College, Winchester	7,436,957	125,399	188,098	266,473
King's College London	101,437,671	1,710,400	2,565,600	3,634,599
Kingston University	45,273,171	763,377	1,145,066	1,622,177
Lancaster University	39,314,855	662,911	994,366	1,408,685
University of Leeds	104,622,793	1,764,106	2,646,159	3,748,725
Leeds Metropolitan University	55,077,184	928,689	1,393,033	1,973,463
University of Leicester	51,370,396	866,186	1,299,279	1,840,646
University of Lincolnshire & Humberside	35,916,945	605,617	908,425	1,286,935
University of Liverpool	80,107,871	1,350,746	2,026,118	2,870,334
Liverpool Hope	13,125,100	221,310	331,965	470,284
Liverpool John Moores University	58,136,159	980,268	1,470,401	2,083,069
University of London - Institutes and Activities	4,635,704	78,165	117,248	166,101
London Business School	4,222,762	71,202	106,804	151,305
London School of Economics & Political Science	21,960,911	370,296	555,444	786,878
London Guildhall University	36,246,452	611,173	916,759	1,298,742
London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine	9,267,887	156,271	234,407	332,076
The London Institute	36,822,713	620,889	931,334	1,319,390
Loughborough University	49,430,590	833,478	1,250,217	1,771,141
University of Luton	26,036,424	439,015	658,523	932,908
University of Manchester	103,832,692	1,750,784	2,626,175	3,720,415
UMIST	37,354,280	629,852	944,778	1,338,436
Manchester Metropolitan University	83,975,456	1,415,959	2,123,939	3,008,913
Middlesex University	56,231,237	948,148	1,422,221	2,014,814
University of Newcastle upon Tyne	72,901,617	1,229,237	1,843,855	2,612,128
Newman College	1,829,998	30,857	46,285	65,570
University College Northampton	23,703,863	399,685	599,527	849,330
University of North London	41,891,758	706,361	1,059,542	1,501,018
Northern School of Contemporary Dance	1,054,987	17,789	26,683	37,801
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	53,887,737	908,633	1,362,949	1,930,844
Norwich School of Art & Design	2,996,067	50,518	75,778	107,352
University of Nottingham	78,438,358	1,322,595	1,983,892	2,810,514
Nottingham Trent University	67,391,755	1,136,332	1,704,497	2,414,705
Open University	162,228,167	2,735,424	4,103,136	5,812,775
School of Oriental and African Studies	12,382,813	208,794	313,191	443,687
University of Oxford	127,348,302	2,147,294	3,220,941	4,563,000
Oxford Brookes University	35,021,623	590,520	885,780	1,254,855
School of Pharmacy	5,298,172	89,336	134,003	189,838
University of Plymouth	63,519,472	1,071,039	1,606,558	2,275,958
University of Portsmouth	53,189,502	896,859	1,345,289	1,905,826
Queen Mary and Westfield College	54,459,652	918,276	1,377,414	1,951,336
Ravensbourne College	3,715,683	62,652	93,978	133,136
RCN Institute	2,016,676	34,004	51,007	72,259
University of Reading	46,419,703	782,710	1,174,065	1,663,258
College of Ripon & York St John	8,926,058	150,507	225,761	319,828
Rose Bruford College	3,124,146	52,678	79,017	111,941
Royal Academy of Music	4,486,299	75,646	113,469	160,748
Royal Agricultural College	2,971,769	50,109	75,163	106,481
Royal College of Art	12,053,004	203,233	304,849	431,870
Royal College of Music	4,332,597	73,054	109,582	155,241
Royal Holloway, University of London	25,737,904	433,982	650,973	922,211
Royal Northern College of Music	4,830,773	81,454	122,182	173,091
Royal Veterinary College	10,996,812	185,424	278,135	394,025
St George's Hospital Medical School	13,369,067	225,424	338,135	479,025
College of St Mark & St John	4,135,414	69,730	104,594	148,175

St Martin's College	8,695,727	146,624	219,936	311,575
St Mary's College	6,469,779	109,091	163,636	231,818
University of Salford	52,734,830	889,193	1,333,789	1,889,535
University of Sheffield	86,768,898	1,463,061	2,194,591	3,109,005
Sheffield Hallam University	68,072,714	1,147,814	1,721,721	2,439,104
University of Southampton	76,571,930	1,291,124	1,936,686	2,743,638
Southampton Institute	36,110,537	608,881	913,321	1,293,872
South Bank University	50,596,110	853,131	1,279,696	1,812,902
Staffordshire University	49,871,118	840,906	1,261,359	1,786,925
University of Sunderland	38,987,715	657,395	986,092	1,396,964
The Surrey Inst of Art & Design University College	10,077,879	169,929	254,893	361,099
University of Surrey	35,332,813	595,767	893,651	1,266,005
University of Surrey Roehampton	18,228,795	307,366	461,050	653,153
University of Sussex	40,670,326	685,766	1,028,649	1,457,253
University of Teesside	32,285,342	544,382	816,573	1,156,812
Thames Valley University	28,393,591	478,761	718,141	1,017,367
Trinity & All Saints	5,306,813	89,481	134,222	190,148
Trinity College of Music	3,309,524	55,804	83,706	118,583
University College London	129,270,161	2,179,700	3,269,549	4,631,862
University of Warwick	53,375,548	899,996	1,349,994	1,912,492
University of West of England, Bristol	60,123,396	1,013,776	1,520,663	2,154,273
University of Westminster	59,157,133	997,483	1,496,224	2,119,651
Wimbledon School of Art	3,590,390	60,540	90,809	128,647
University of Wolverhampton	53,481,002	901,774	1,352,662	1,916,270
University College Worcester	8,764,639	147,786	221,679	314,045
Writtle College	5,115,442	86,254	129,382	183,291
University of York	35,237,690	594,163	891,245	1,262,597
Arts Institute at Bournemouth	3,225,050	54,379	81,569	115,556
Total	**4,744,513,382**	**80,000,006**	**120,000,008**	**170,000,012**

Indicative TTA allocations for rewarding and developing staff in HE (£)*

	Mainstream funding 2001-02	HR Supplement 2001-02	HR Supplement 2002-03	HR Supplement 2003-04
Anglia Polytechnic University	1,438,502	34,620	52,197	82,633
University of Bath	691,437	16,641	25,089	39,719
Bath Spa University College	2,106,076	50,686	76,420	120,981
University of Birmingham	1,506,117	36,247	54,650	86,517
Bishop Grosseteste College	2,427,635	58,425	88,088	139,453
University of Brighton	4,790,039	115,280	173,810	275,158
University of Bristol	854,417	20,563	31,003	49,081
Brunel University	2,164,671	52,096	78,546	124,347
University of Cambridge	692,864	16,675	25,141	39,801
Canterbury Christ Church University College	4,956,963	119,297	179,867	284,747
University of Central England	2,451,008	58,987	88,936	140,795
Central School of Speech and Drama	217,327	5,230	7,886	12,484
Cheltenham and Gloucester College of HE	2,123,732	51,111	77,061	121,995
Chester College of Higher Education	1,626,573	39,146	59,021	93,437
University College Chichester	2,862,330	68,887	103,861	164,423
De Montfort University	3,888,216	93,576	141,086	223,354
University of Derby	978,143	23,541	35,493	56,188
University of Durham	2,393,013	57,592	86,832	137,464
University of East Anglia	1,385,263	33,339	50,265	79,575
University of East London	764,055	18,388	27,724	43,890
Edge Hill College of Higher Education	5,269,324	126,815	191,201	302,690
Institute of Education	3,666,832	88,248	133,053	210,637

University of Exeter	2,621,536	63,092	95,124	150,591
Goldsmiths College	2,200,171	52,951	79,835	126,386
University of Greenwich	2,029,979	48,855	73,659	116,610
University of Hertfordshire	1,945,625	46,825	70,598	111,764
Homerton College, Cambridge	2,744,283	66,046	99,578	157,642
University of Huddersfield	842,350	20,273	30,565	48,388
University of Hull	1,594,307	38,370	57,850	91,583
Keele University	1,229,790	29,597	44,624	70,644
King Alfred's College, Winchester	2,604,475	62,681	94,505	149,611
King's College London	832,796	20,043	30,219	47,839
Kingston University	1,415,865	34,075	51,376	81,333
University of Leeds	3,103,145	74,682	112,600	178,257
Leeds Metropolitan University	1,950,984	46,954	70,793	112,072
University of Leicester	1,334,576	32,119	48,426	76,663
Liverpool Hope	4,381,949	105,459	159,002	251,716
Liverpool John Moores University	3,050,534	73,416	110,691	175,234
Loughborough University	628,870	15,135	22,819	36,125
University of Manchester	1,090,541	26,246	39,571	62,645
Manchester Metropolitan University	8,944,327	215,260	324,551	513,797
Middlesex University	1,628,350	39,189	59,086	93,539
University of Newcastle upon Tyne	1,295,243	31,172	46,999	74,404
Newman College	2,385,536	57,412	86,561	137,034
University College Northampton	1,201,401	28,914	43,594	69,013
University of North London	1,429,282	34,398	51,862	82,103
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	1,237,852	29,791	44,916	71,107
University of Nottingham	1,331,453	32,044	48,313	76,484
Nottingham Trent University	2,432,531	58,543	88,266	139,734
Open University	991,463	23,861	35,976	56,953
University of Oxford	556,066	13,383	20,177	31,943
Oxford Brookes University	2,612,944	62,885	94,812	150,098
University of Plymouth	2,307,520	55,534	83,730	132,553
University of Portsmouth	351,085	8,449	12,739	20,168
University of Reading	1,870,293	45,012	67,865	107,437
College of Ripon & York St John	2,502,222	60,220	90,795	143,737
College of St Mark & St John	3,191,949	76,819	115,822	183,358
St Martin's College	8,294,488	199,620	300,971	476,467
St Mary's College	2,534,417	60,995	91,963	145,587
University of Sheffield	596,640	14,359	21,649	34,273
Sheffield Hallam University	4,359,124	104,909	158,174	250,405
University of Southampton	1,188,348	28,600	43,120	68,263
South Bank University	789,624	19,004	28,652	45,359
Staffordshire University	80,621	1,940	2,925	4,631
University of Sunderland	3,204,705	77,126	116,285	184,091
University of Surrey Roehampton	4,608,565	110,913	167,225	264,734
University of Sussex	593,771	14,290	21,545	34,108
University of Teesside	112,975	2,719	4,099	6,490
Trinity & All Saints	2,078,651	50,026	75,425	119,406
University of Warwick	2,523,394	60,730	91,563	144,954
University of West of England, Bristol	3,089,753	74,360	112,114	177,487
University of Wolverhampton	1,392,615	33,516	50,532	79,997
University College Worcester	2,129,124	51,241	77,257	122,305
University of York	532,552	12,817	19,324	30,592
Total	**159,235,193**	**3,832,254**	**5,777,949**	**9,147,085**

* Allocations for 2002-03 and 2003-04 will be recalculated each year using the same formulaic approach.

Annex D

List of respondents to HEFCE consultation 00/56

Universities

Anglia Polytechnic University

Aston University

University of Bath

Birkbeck College

Bournemouth University

University of Bradford

University of Brighton

University of Bristol

Brunel University

University of Cambridge

University of Central Lancashire

City University

Coventry University

De Montfort University

University of Derby

University of Durham

University of East Anglia

University of East London

University of Essex

University of Exeter

Goldsmiths College

University of Greenwich

University of Hertfordshire

University of Huddersfield

University of Hull

Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine

Keele University

University of Kent at Canterbury

King's College London

Kingston University

Lancaster University

University of Leeds

Leeds Metropolitan University

University of Leicester

University of Lincolnshire and Humberside

Liverpool John Moores University

University of London

London Guildhall University

London School of Economics and Political Science

Loughborough University

University of Luton

University of Manchester

UMIST

Manchester Metropolitan University

Middlesex University

University of Newcastle

University of Northumbria at Newcastle

University of Nottingham

Open University

University of Oxford

University of Plymouth

University of Portsmouth

University of Reading

Royal Holloway, University of London

University of Salford

University of Sheffield

Sheffield Hallam University

University of Southampton

Staffordshire University

University of Surrey

University of Sussex

University of Teesside

Thames Valley University

University College London

University of Warwick

University of the West of England, Bristol

University of Westminster

University of Wolverhampton

University of York

General colleges

Canterbury Christ Church University College

Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Education

Chester College of Higher Education

University College Chichester

Edge Hill College of Higher Education

King Alfred's College, Winchester

Liverpool Hope

University College Northampton

College of Ripon & York St John

Trinity and All Saints College

St Mary's College

Southampton Institute

University of Surrey Roehampton

University College Worcester

Specialist institutions

Arts Institute at Bournemouth

Bishop Grosseteste College

Central School of Speech and Drama

Cumbria College of Art and Design

Dartington College of Arts

Falmouth College of Arts

The Institute of Cancer Research

The Institute of Education

Kent Institute of Art and Design

The London Institute

Newman College

School of Oriental and African Studies

School of Pharmacy

Ravensbourne College of Design & Communication

Royal Academy of Music

Royal College of Art

Royal College of Music

Royal Northern College of Music

Royal Veterinary College

St George's Hospital Medical School

College of St Mark and St John

St Martin's College

Surrey Institute of Art & Design, University College

Trinity College of Music

Wimbledon School of Art

Trade unions

Association of University Teachers (AUT)

AUT Leeds

Manufacturing Science and Finance

National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education

Unison

Representative bodies

The Association of Colleges

The Association of University Administrators

British Dental Association

British Medical Association

Educational Competences Consortium Ltd

The Engineering Council

Higher Education Staff Development Agency

Natural Resources Institute of the University of Greenwich (branch executive committee of the Institution of Professionals, Managers and Specialists)

SCOP

UCEA

Universities and Colleges Information Systems Association

Universities UK

Others

Dr Lynne Jones MP

Equal Opportunities Commission

Technology Innovation Centre (University of Central England)

Annex E

Cover sheet for HR strategies

Contact details

Institution name:

Name of contact:

Title: Position:

Tel: E-mail:

Do you wish this strategy to be considered as:

Full ☐ Emerging ☐

Checklist

	Tick box
If you are submitting an emerging strategy, have you stated how you will develop a full strategy?	
Does your strategy state how and when you will address priority areas a, b and c of Annex B?	
Does your strategy state how and when you will address priority areas d, e and f of Annex B?	
Does your strategy identify objectives?	
Have you included specific targets?	
Does your strategy provide a breakdown of how you will spend the funding?	
Have you shown how this HR strategy integrates with your corporate plan and other institutional strategies (such as learning and teaching, widening participation, research, HEROBC)?	
Does this HR strategy make specific reference to staff development within research strategies?	

Higher Education Funding Council for England
Northavon House
Coldharbour Lane
BRISTOL
BS16 1QD

tel 0117 931 7317
fax 0117 931 7203
www.hefce.ac.uk